

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/912,561 | 07/26/2001 | Toshiharu Katsuki | Q65527 | 5480 |
| 7590 05/04/2004 SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC 2100 Pennsylvania Avenue | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | JUSKA, CHERYL ANN | |
| Washington, DC 20037-3213 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| _ | | | 1771 | |

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/912,561 | KATSUKI ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Action | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Cheryl Juska | 1771 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | |
| FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee mave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any | | | | | | |
| above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three in earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | Offices after the maining date of the initial re- | soudif, over it among theat, may reduce and | , | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) M they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) Methey present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Some state of the second se | or reconsideration has been con See Continuation Sheet. | sidered but does NOT place the | 3 | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | ecause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which were newly | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims v | $\operatorname{nt}(s)$ a) \boxtimes will not be entered or would be rejected is provided be | b)⊡ will be entered and an low or appended. | | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows | 5 : | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 6-10 and 12-17. | • | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-5 and 1 | <u>'1</u> . | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) ap | ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statem | 7 | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | Cheryl Juska Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1771 | | | | |

©ontinuation Sheet (PTOL-303) 009/912,561

Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Said amendment is non-compliant with respect to 37 CFR 1.121 in that the text of cancelled claims should not be written out. Additionally, new claim 18 raises the question of new matter with respect to the "space between yarn strands."

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's argument with respect to the 112, 2n rejection is unpersuasive. Specifically, it is is unclear how a single fiber can be comprised of a plurality of fibers (i.e., some synthetic fiber and some other fiber). If applicant intends the claim term "fiber" to encompass "yarn" as is suggested in applicant's Remarks, then the claims should be amended accordingly.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the order of the coating steps have been noted. Said argument would likely overcome the anticipation rejection, but an obviousnessness rejection would have to be considered.

Upon entry, applicant's amendment to claim 17 would be sufficient to overcome the 112, 1st rejection of said claim.

PRIMARY EXAMINER